

REMARKS

Interview summary: On October 17, 2006, Examiner Williams and LeRoy Maunu discussed the §112 and §102 rejections of claim 1. While it was not agreed upon what modification was needed, if any, to overcome the §112 rejections, portions of the specification were discussed relative to the limitations in question. Specifically, page 4, l. 28-29, l. 32-33; p. 5, l. 9-12; p. 5, l. 32 – p. 6, l. 2; and p7, l. 6-9 were discussed as providing a written description for the claim limitations in question. The undersigned also explained how Aziz does not show that his relays (FIG. 3, 320) send to the server 340 for each communication from one of the clients 300 to the server, a session identifier that the server has provided to the relay for communication with that client. No agreement was reached.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application, and reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Office Action Summary page has the box checked indicating that the drawings are objected to. The drawings are understood to be acceptable for examination and publication purposes, and Applicants request that the box be unchecked in the next communication. If there are problems with the drawings, Applicants respectfully request an explanation of the deficiencies in the drawings. If no explanation is provided Applicants will proceed with the understanding that the box has been inadvertently checked.

The rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is respectfully traversed. Written description of the claim limitations may be found in the specification, for example, on p. 4, l. 28-29, l. 32-33; p. 5, l. 9-12; p. 5, l. 32 – p. 6, l. 2; and p. 7, l. 6-9. The rejection is moot, however, in view of the amendments to the claims.

Applicants continue to traverse the rejection under 35 USC §102(e) over US patent 6,643,701 to Aziz et al. (“Aziz”), the rejection under 35 USC §103(a) over Aziz in view of “Davis” (U.S. Patent No. 6,367,009 to Davis et al.), and the rejection under 35 USC §103(a) over the Aziz-Davis combination in view of “Sparks” (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,382 to Sparks et al.). The traversals of the rejections of the previous Office

Action and the arguments presented in response to those rejections, as set forth in the Amendment dated June 21, 2006, are maintained and incorporated by reference in this response.

Withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the remarks set forth above. No extension of time is believed to be necessary for consideration of this response. However, if an extension of time is required, please consider this a petition for a sufficient number of months for consideration of this response. If there are any additional fees in connection with this response, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0996 (HPCO.038PA).

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
Saint Paul, MN 55120
(651) 686-6633

By: 
Name: LeRoy D. Maunu
Reg. No.: 35,274